

**Comments and Responses to the March 10, 2005
tentative Order No. R9-2005-0091
Waste Discharge Requirements
for
SeaWorld San Diego
San Diego County**

The Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region (Regional Board) issued tentative Order No. R9-2005-0091 for public comment on March 11, 2005. One comment document was received from SeaWorld San Diego (SeaWorld). The SeaWorld comment document was received on March 30, 2005 and is included in the supplemental mailing for the Agenda package. This is the Regional Board's response to those comments.

Comments received from SeaWorld, dated March 30, 2005.

#	Page	Paragraph / Section	Comment	Response to comments
Tentative Order No. R9-2005-0091				
1	3	Section II B	References to sodium bisulfate and sodium sulfate should be changed to sodium bisulfite and sodium sulfite respectively.	The errata sheet modifies the section as noted.
2	7 and 17; and F-30 of 39	Section III C 3, Section XI, 3 (a)(i) and Section VII B (a)(i) of Attachment F	Draining of aquaria and pools should be allowed during a storm event provided a by-pass discharge does not occur.	The errata sheet modifies the sections as noted.
3	8	Table 6 and	Can the basis for limitation for suspended solids	The suspended solids limitation for no increase

#	Page	Paragraph / Section	Comment	Response to comments
	and 9	Table 7	(i.e. for no increase of 10 mg/L for a monthly average and 15 mg/L for a daily maximum) be explained?	<p>beyond 10 mg/L for Outfall 001 and 002 has been in the waste discharge requirements since at least 1975. Prior to 1975, Order No. 63-R15 had a narrative limitation for suspended solids discharged to Mission Bay.</p> <p>From a review of the adopted Orders since 1963 the origin of the 10 mg/L increase over the intake for suspended solids was not identified.</p> <p>The suspended solids limitation in the tentative Order is a continuation of the limitation from the current Waste Discharge Requirements, Order No. 2000-0025, and Order No. 95-36 (previous to Order No. 2000-25) had the same suspended solids limitation as Order No. 2000-25.</p> <p>The Order before Order No. 95-36, Order No. 86-12, had a suspended solids effluent limitations of <i>no increase in excess of 10% or 10 mg/L, whichever is greater, when compared to the intake.</i></p> <p>The Orders before Order No. 86-12, Order No. 80-10, and Order 75-08 had suspended solid limitations for daily maximum of <i>less than 10% of intake or 10 mg/L whichever is greater.</i></p>

#	Page	Paragraph / Section	Comment	Response to comments
4	D-2 of 12	Section I A part 7	The provision for bypass is confusing and we suggest moving the Provision and provide new title.	<p>A change is not recommended to the Provision. The section is a listing of requirements in 40 CFR 122.41(m).</p> <p>The State Board's contractor provided the Provisions. Though the permit writer changed some of the wording, the language is essentially an accurate copy of 40 CFR 122.41.</p>
5	E-6 of 14	Section V B	Suggested language for chronic toxicity testing.	The errata sheet modifies the section as noted.
6	E-8 of 14	Section IX A.2	Suggest to language change <i>station</i> to <i>location</i> .	The errata sheet modifies the section as noted.
7	E-9 of 14	Section IX C	Language regarding Special Studies is vague. A reference or parallel language as found in Section XI of the tentative Order (p. 7 of 21) and the Fact Sheet (p. 35 of 39) would make monitoring requirement consistent with the Order and Fact Sheet.	The errata sheet modifies the section as noted.